

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 are pending in the present Application. Claims 23-32 have been withdrawn, Claims 2 and 18 have been cancelled, and Claims 1, 3-4, 7-8, 11-12, 14-16, and 22 have been amended, leaving Claims 1, 2-17, and 19-22 for consideration upon entry of the present Amendment. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Response to Restriction Requirement

Applicants hereby confirm the election of Claims 1-22 for prosecution.

Amendment to Title

The title has been amended to more specifically describe the invention. "Method of making" has been added to the title since it is Applicants' intent to request rejoinder of the claims directed to the method of making the composition upon allowability of the claims directed to the composition.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite, on the basis that it is unclear as to how an acrylate could have a functionality of "1" since at least two functional groups are required for crosslinking. Applicants respectfully submit that an oligomer or monomer having a single (meth)acrylate functionality, i.e., a functionality of "1", is capable of crosslinking because each of ethylenically unsaturated carbons in the (meth)acrylate group is capable of reaction with a different molecule. An oligomer or monomer having a (meth)acrylate functionality of 1 can therefore act as a crosslinker between two different molecules.

The Examiner further suggests amending "acrylate" to (meth)acrylate for clarity. Applicants thank the Examiner for the suggestion, and have amended the claims accordingly.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly unpatentable over

Katsamberis (5,426,131), Tamaya et al (5,494,645), Tamura (5,635,544), Patel (5,811,472), and
~~WO 97/11129 / US 6,306,50.~~ The claims have further been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as
obvious over Lewis et al. (5,712,325).


The present claims have been amended to recite compositions specifically comprising a polyurethane di(meth)acrylate in combination with hexanediol dimethacrylate. As is shown in the examples, such compositions result in films that have both flexibility and excellent haze resistance. The general disclosures of the cited references do not teach or suggest that a film that is both flexible and scratch resistant can be obtained using this specific combination of reactants. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of the claims.

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicants. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance is requested.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 07-0862.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By 
Roberta L. Pelletier
Registration No. 23,413

Date: January 5, 2004